

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 94 04:30:06 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #230
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 1 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 230

Today's Topics:

 ARRL Replies to proposed rules on Vanity Calls (2 msgs)
 Legal Protections for Hams

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>

Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>

Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 31 May 1994 20:21:29 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!panix!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL Replies to proposed rules on Vanity Calls
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <5c.6608.22.0N17C6EA@pplace.com>,
Pat Wilson <pat.wilson@pplace.com> wrote:
>Is it just me, (what an opening, huh) or is no-one else against the
>changes the ARRL wants to make in the Vanity Call proposal?

Well, as far as I'm concerned it may be just you...

>1. Calls belong to individuals, not as heirlooms to be willed down the
> line of breeding.

Callsigns don't "belong" to anyone, they're assigned for use by the FCC.
However, if we're going to let people select unused callsigns, it seems
perfectly reasonable to let an individual have first crack at the
callsign previously assigned to their late father, mother, or other relative.

>2. Clubs should get in line, just like anyone else to receive calls,
> not get special dispensation. They are no better, nor worse than
> anyone individual. The MAN makes the call, not the CALL making the
> man (club).

I disagree. If an individual was an active member of a club, the club may well wish to memorialize him/her by keeping their callsign in use. And it seems totally proper to me that a club should be able to do this, and that it be considered a higher priority than making the callsign previously assigned to a deceased individual available to a non-relative.

>3. If you can't get one outa ten, what on earth makes you think you can
> get one in TWENTY FIVE. (You should research a little more
> carefully.)

I'm not a mathematician, but I believe that one is 2.5 times more likely to find an available call with a list of 25 than with a list of 10.

Bottom line, the ARRL comments seem quite reasonable to me.

73, Andy

--

----- Andrew Funk, KB7UV -----
| ENG Editor/Microwave Control, WCBS-TV Channel 2 News, New York |
| Internet: kb7uv@panix.com Packet: kb7uv@kb7uv.#nli.ny.usa |
| --- INSERT COMMERCIAL HERE --- |

Date: 1 Jun 1994 00:45:28 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!eff!news.kei.com!
ssd.intel.com!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: ARRL Replies to proposed rules on Vanity Calls
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Andrew Funk (kb7uv@panix.com) wrote:
: However, if we're going to let people select unused callsigns, it seems
: perfectly reasonable to let an individual have first crack at the
: callsign previously assigned to their late father, mother, or other relative.

Hi Andy, I would like to have first crack at my old call sign that the FCC made me give up when I moved from Texas to California in 1971.

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: 1 Jun 1994 03:37:55 GMT
From: yar.cs.wisc.edu!jhanson@rsch.wisc.edu
Subject: Legal Protections for Hams
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I am a candidate for the Wisconsin legislature this fall and (as an Extra who cares about ham radio concerns) would like to prepare a sheet for my district's ham population. What I am interested in is ideas for state laws that hams would appreciate...

Ideas I have so far include:

- 1) Opposition to scanner/radio bans, etc.
- 2) Adoption of PRB-1 (with possible revisions) into statutory form (I know about federal preemption, but this would make cases easier for hams...)
- 3) Developing stronger partnerships between state and ARES/RACES, etc.

Any input (or money <grin>) you could provide would be appreciated!

--
Jason J. Hanson | 22 Langdon Street #220 | (608) 256-1004
Univ. of Wisconsin | Madison, WI 53703-1344 | Ham: N9LEA (Extra)
-- jhanson@yar.cs.wisc.edu =+++= n9lea@wd9esu.#scwi.wi.usa.noam --

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 03:08:08 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!
rogjd@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2sfn3r\$okg@network.ucsd.edu>, <1994May31.173353.21886@cs.brown.edu>, <1994May31.193141.18921@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, £
Subject : Re: Ham Radio few problem

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:
: In article <1994May31.173353.21886@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu
(Michael P. Deignan) writes:
: >
: >As the trustee of a coordinated closed repeater, if anyone told me that I had
: >a choice to either "open" my machine or loose coordination, I would opt for
: >choice number three: protect my legal, FCC-recognized closed repeater
: >coordination via litigation.

: And after enriching the lawyers to the tune of several thousands or tens
: of thousands of dollars, you could still lose. The FCC does *not* recognize

Hey, what's wrong with enriching lawyers? I start law school in a few months. Let him litigate, for goshakes!

: closed repeater *coordination*. All they recognize is closed repeater
: *operation*. They recognize coordination status *only* in resolving mutual
: interference issues without regard to issues of closed or open. The FCC
: doesn't mandate a particular coordination policy. Coordination policy is
: a public policy issue internal to the amateur community, made and administered
: by local amateurs, and courts have traditionally been reluctant to overturn
: such policies absent a compelling public benefit.

: Gary
: --

Gary, you are exactly right, and I agree with all of the above. Forgive my little fun :-)

--

rogjd@netcom.com
Glendale, CA
AB6WR

Date: Wed, 1 Jun 1994 03:13:22 GMT
From: walter!dancer.cc.bellcore.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2s8fm0\$9hm@chnews.intel.com>, <1994May28.234559.17328@cs.brown.edu>, <2sfed0\$ipq@news.iastate.edu>.com
Subject : Re: Merge the CW test with the Theory Test

In article <1994May28.234559.17328@cs.brown.edu>, md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>|> Considering the sources Newsline used to conduct their "poll", it
additional stuff about polls, etc deleted for non-relavance...

Just like to point out that this discussion thread has been conveniently sidelined into the pros/cons of what constitutes an accurate poll of the ham community as opposed to a discussion of the merits of merging the CW test with the theory test.

It is also worth noting that not one viable opposing viewpoint has been aired to refute the suggested merging. Instead, it seems the effort has been to quickly change the subject. Me thinks I've struck a sensitive and vulnerable area with the suggestion and I'll plan to air it in as many venues as possible.

So...forget the polling questions and let's see some real discussion of the issue: For a reminder, here's what I've proposed:

Retain the 5wpm CW test as is for Novice and Tech+.

For the General, and Extra class tests, merge the CW test results (the 10 questions) with the theory tests, thus eliminating the pass/fail aspect of the 13 and 20wpm testing while retaining CW as a mode being tested.

The above "merging" of CW test results with the theory test results provides no more or less emphasis on CW than on any other mode or theory subject area.
Retaining the 5wpm as a stand-alone pass/fail more than satisfies all aspects of international treaty.

So...back to the issues and let's try to not get sidetracked again.

Cheers,

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)
Morristown, NJ email via UUCP bcr!cc!whs70
201-829-2879 Weekdays email via Internet whs70@cc.bellcore.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #230
